THE

# JUNIUS TRACTS.

## No. V.

Nov'r.] PUBLISHED EVERY SECOND MONTH. [1843.

# POLITICAL ABOLITION.

**BY JUNIUS.**

Author of "The Crisis of the Country," and other Tracts of 1840.

*Price, 3 cents single, $2 50 cts. per 100, or $20 per 1000.*

Tracts already published.

No. I. THE TEST, or Parties tried by their Acts.
" II. THE CURRENCY.
" III. THE TARIFF.
" IV. LIFE OF HENRY CLAY.
" V. POLITICAL ABOLITION.

☞ NOTICE: Committees, Clubs, and all persons desirous of obtaining these Tracts, are requested to send their orders, with remittances, to the publishers, *Greeley & McElrath, Tribune Office, New York*, who will promptly forward them to any part of the Union, as may be directed. Remittances by mail, *post paid or free*, at the risk of the proprietor. Price for any one of the series, $2 50 cts. per 100 copies, or $20 per 1000.

☞ Postmasters are authorized by law to make remittances under their frank.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY GREELEY & McELRATH,

TRIBUNE BUILDINGS, 160 NASSAU STREET.

1844.

[Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1843, by Calvin Colton, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Southern District of New York.]

☞ Extracts in Newspapers, for purpose of review, are allowed, but the republication of this Tract is forbidden.

[One Sheet Periodical, Postage under 100 miles 1½ cents; over 100 miles 2½.]

# POLITICAL ABOLITION.

*1. The Author's position on the subject of slavery.*

It is that of a Northern man, born and educated in a free State, always opposed to slavery, still opposed to it, judging it to be wrong, and desiring to see it abolished, as well in this country, as in all others. This he assumes to be the general feeling of the people in the free States, as he has rarely found an instance to the contrary. We, therefore, of the free States, (we speak for the great body of the people,) do not yield to the Abolitionists a whit in our *opposition* to slavery; we differ from them only as to the *mode* of getting rid of the evil. We claim to be the *true* friends of the slave, while we believe them to be pursuing a course hostile to his best interests, and unfavorable to his emancipation.

*2. The origin of slavery in the United States.*

It is enough to say, that it was *imposed* upon the Colonies, by the British Government, for the augmentation of its revenue and the profit of its favorites, *against* the anxious protests of the Colonists themselves, and that while the Colonies were subject to the British Crown, it had grown to an extent not easy to be eradicated. *Thus far*, the responsibility of its introduction and growth, is settled. When the Colonies became independent, and were about to set up the Government of the United States, those members of the Confederation, which had slavery as a part of their state of society, foreseeing the evils of interference with this subject from other quarters, refused to come into the Union under the Constitution, without an express stipulation to secure their exclusive control of the slave question within their respective limits, which condition was acceded to. Such, briefly, is the origin of slavery in the United States.

*3. The more remote origin of Occidental or American slavery of the African race.*

It began in a proposal of Las Casas, a Roman Catholic priest, to the Spanish Government, for authority to introduce Africans by importation into the West Indies, to save the natives, who were being exterminated by hard service and severe treatment under the Spaniards. His object was benevolent. From that germe, African slavery spread over this Western world. Its still *more* remote origin, however, lay in the previous debased condition and barbarous customs of the African tribes, which *invited* the Asiatics on the East and Europeans on the North, to trade in the bodies and souls of men, whom portions of their own race, by prowess of arms, had first made captive, and then exposed for sale—a custom of the African tribes, or hordes, practised from time immemorial. We mention it not as an apology for the more civilized portions of the world, for engaging in this inhuman traffic, but as an historical fact to account for the *origin* of African slavery. It originated in the barbarous passions and habits of the race.

*4. How the subject of slavery should be approached.*

For all that the United States are concerned in it, it is manifest, that the present Government and people of this country, are in no wise responsible for its origin. It was entailed as a calamity, and its being on the hands of any of the States, when we acquired our independence, can not be charged as a crime. They are only responsible for the manner in which they treat it, and for the disposition that shall be ultimately made of it. They who believe in that Providence, with whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," will look forward for some grand and beneficent result to grow out of that *providential* treatment, which has marked the history of this race for centuries past. It is a great wheel moving round, and notwithstanding all the clouds and darkness that have overhung it, some rays of light have dawned on its progress. Miracles of relief are not to be expected; but relief will come at last.

*5. Definition.*

By *political* abolition, as used in this Tract, we mean that well-known movement, got up in the free States, to accomplish this object, by resorting to the ballot-box, in its bearings on the National Administration. It can not be denied, that the ballot-box is a primary and fundamental political power. All other political powers above it, are only its instruments and agents. Whatever may result from this primary function of the body politic, these primary actors are responsible for. It is this power which directs and controls the offices of legislation, the functions of magistracy, and the sword of war. It is the original and effective agency of political society, in a popular government like ours.

*6. The formation of our Government.*

It has been justly called a Government of *compromise*, on account of the variety of conflicting interests which had to be consulted before its consummation. The achievement of Independence was but half the work. We were a spectacle to the whole world as to what we

should come to. The friends of liberty were anxious, its enemies still hoped for our failure, while we had to encounter appalling difficulties. The Confederation proved miserably deficient, and nothing could exceed the concern of our most eminent patriots, till the Constitution was finally adopted. It was entirely a new kind of government, composed of wheels within a wheel, of inferior sovereignties allied to one superior and general. In the construction of this machinery, it was necessary exactly to define the powers of the General Government, so as not to interfere with those of the States. This being done, the powers of the States, called *State Rights*, are determined by the following Article, the Tenth of the Amendments :—"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are *reserved* to the States *respectively*, or to the people." From this article is derived the *exclusive* power of the slave States over slavery within their *respective* limits, it being *one* of the powers "*not* delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States." In all such powers, the States are as sovereign as any independent nations.

7. *The political compact of the Union—political rights resulting therefrom.*

While we are *one* nation, we are *many* States, and the States are not provinces, recognising in *all* things the supremacy of the national authorities; nor municipal corporations, acting in the capacity of counties and towns, under a commonwealth; but they are original, independent, and sovereign powers *in all things* "not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States;" and these delegated and prohibited powers were not *imposed* by authority, but *surrendered by compact*, while the States were acting in the capacity of original and independent sovereignties. It was of the nature of a treaty between nations, as a political transaction, though more intimate and more solemn, having in view a different and more comprehensive object—viz: a supreme and supervising authority as to the powers "*delegated*." But the political rights "*reserved*," are as independent and sovereign, as those of two nations are, under compact of a treaty, in all things not belonging to the treaty. This view, which we believe to be correct, is important to our present purpose.

8. *The importance and solemnity of the Union as a compromise between the parties.*

But for this compromise, the struggle and cost of the American Revolution would in all probability have been wasted. It was indispensably necessary to save and secure the freedom and independence we had acquired. The parties to this compact had diverse interests to protect, and diverse difficulties to encounter. The arrangement, as finally adjusted and ratified, was regarded by our fathers as one of great solemnity and of unspeakable importance. It was viewed with a kind of religious awe, and with conscientious respect. The man that would lift his hand to impair or disturb it, would have been scathed by the reprobation of a universal public sentiment—a feeling that has been cherished from that time to this, and ever ought to be cherished.

9. *Where lies the responsibility of slavery under this compact.*

Do we, the people of the United States, hold ourselves responsible for any of the laws and institutions of Great Britain, of France, or of any other foreign and independent power, because we happen to be under a treaty with them? It is true, indeed, that the treaty or compact of this Union, is not *precisely* of the same character with our treaty stipulations with foreign nations, as it bears on the question before us, *in that it goes farther*, and is more particular in its specifications. We never promise, that we will not meddle with the domestic regulations of foreign powers, when we make treaties with them; for it is not deemed necessary. But we *have* promised, and solemnly engaged, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, *are*" (of course, *shall be*) "*reserved* to the States *respectively*." But, the political compact of a treaty with a foreign power, so far as it goes, *is* precisely of the same *political* character with the political compact of this Union. How, then, can the free States, or the people of those States, be responsible for slavery in other States, which, as high contracting political parties, they have solemnly engaged never to meddle with? This power is "*reserved*" to those States. If the free States, or the people of those States, ever had anything to do in originating slavery, they have atoned for it by abolishing it. The slave States never surrendered the care, nor transferred the responsibility of slavery, either to the General Government, or to the free States, or to any parties whatever. How, then, can the General Government, or the free States, or any of their parts or agencies, be responsible for that which they not only never had in charge, but expressly stipulated not to assume? The responsibility of this engagement may be brought home with great force from the other side, nor is it possible to escape from it. More than this :—There is an oath of allegiance, always implied in the use of a political power in the State, and in many States actually administered to voters and public officers, to support the Constitution of the United States. Put these obligations together, and they present a formidable obstacle to the conscience of a man, who thinks of stepping over or tries to get round them. If, as American citizens, we have no responsibility in the serfdom of Russia, of

Austria, or of Turkey, and if it would be improper for us to interfere with it *politically*, much more as parties to the public and solemn compact of this Union, are we bound to respect its federative engagements.

10. *The proper ground of abolition.*

As an enterprise of humanity and benevolence, employing *moral* means only, in distinction from political agencies, abolition is a proper mission *from* any quarter *to* any quarter. Such has ever been the high ground taken by the Society of Friends *as a body*. They have protested against slavery before the world, and done what they could, by precept and example, by speech and the press, and by various modes of social and moral influence, for its extinction. In this work, they have not only been tolerated, but respected. They have wielded a steady, progressive, and effective influence. Pacific in their principles and practice, they have been admitted into the heart of slave-holding communities, to bear their testimony.

While such was the character of the general anti-slavery feeling and operations of the free States of this Union, their voice was heard, and their influence was salutary. Thousands in the slave States joined with them, and slave-holders themselves were open to argument and conviction, while moral means and pacific measures alone were employed. But the moment when *political* abolition rushed into the field, on the soil of the free States, with severe denunciation and the use of the ballot-box, all the good influence of the anti-slavery phalanx was not only at an end, but a retrograde movement in the cause of emancipation, in the slave States, commenced, and it is yet a moral problem in the aspects of society in that quarter, as to how many years, or how many ages, it may take to recover the ground that has been lost.

11. *Political abolition is force.*

We know that this is not commonly thought of, and would perhaps at first be questioned. But a vote at the polls is the original and fundamental power of American political society, and implies force in the end, if necessary. The first attitude, therefore, or first position of this political power, is that of *incipient* force. It *aims to compel* the accomplishment of its designs by the powers of the State, which are force in abeyance. There is no political power in existence, which is not fortified by force, in abeyance or in actual use, or that could stand one day without it. Such, precisely, is the position assumed by political abolition in the free States.

12. *And it is an aggressive movement.*

This results from the political structure of the Union, before considered. Slavery, in any of these States, occupies the same position, politically, in relation to the other States, which the institutions and laws of the European nations do to the United States. Suppose, then, that a party should start up in this country, and go to the polls, augmenting their forces every year, with the declared object of putting down any one or more of the institutions of a European power, because, in their view, that institution is a bad one, oppressive, and destructive of human liberty. There are many such institutions in Europe. Would it not be regarded as an *aggressive* movement?—And if there were any chance or apprehension of success, would it be a matter of surprise, if the menaced power should put itself on the defensive?—Would it be strange, if that power should take measures to anticipate the movement, and commence aggressive operations, in retaliation? The crusade of the first party might be a very benevolent one; but as a political movement, it would be *aggressive*.

13. *Political abolition, in the free States, is a breach of faith.*

This also results from the political structure of the Union already noticed. Do we hold ourselves at liberty to break a treaty with a foreign power, because we have since concluded that we can not tolerate some evil or evils in its bosom—evils which existed when the treaty was made, which were then considered by us, and which we *agreed* to tolerate, or at least, to leave entirely on their responsibility and in their discretion?—If we originate a new political movement, to disturb this arrangement, do we not violate the treaty?—But the compact of this Union is of a more solemn nature, than a ratified treaty between the United States and a foreign power; nor are the slave States less independent and sovereign, as to the matter in question, than a foreign power, with which we are supposed to be connected by such treaty stipulations.

14. *The impracticability of political abolition.*

We speak of course, in the case now under consideration, of such a movement in the free States towards the slave States. It is impracticable, 1. Because political power is force, and force is offensive. 2. Because the parties assailed, can shield themselves behind the Constitution of the United States. 3. Because, the farther political abolition, from such a quarter, goes, the worse and more hopeless is its cause, both as respects the temper of slave-holders, and the condition of the slaves. 4. Because the limit of such a movement, *unless open violence is meditated*, will be found just where its operations will have had no other effect than to plant obstacles in its own path. 5. And consequently, because, such being the Constitutional bar

rier to this movement, everything done in *this* way, by its moral effect, forces the object in view into a more remote position of possible attainment, if, indeed, it should not render it for ever unattainable.

15. *The mischievous results of political abolition already developed.*

It is well known, that, previous to the start of political abolition in the free States, the spirit of emancipation prevailed extensively in the slave States, and among slave-holders; that the leading and most influential men in those States, were accustomed freely to acknowledge the evils of slavery, and were engaged in benevolent schemes to abate them; that many of them entertained with favor, the purpose of a gradual, and ultimately an entire abolition; that numerous conscientious persons were providing for the emancipation of their own slaves; that entire freedom of speech and of the press, on the subject, was tolerated; that free colored people in the slave States, were generally treated with indulgence, and encouraged; and that this state of feeling had made visible progress, from the organization of our government, down to the outbreak of political abolition in the free States. There was a fair prospect, that one slave State after another, beginning with the more northern, if left to their own free and undisturbed action, would follow the example of New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, in the total extinction of slavery. Such was the state of things, while the subject was left to the *moral* influences operating quietly and pacifically, but effectively, on the public mind. It is but a few years since, that a strong movement was made in the State and legislature of Virginia, for the adoption of a system of emancipation, which was eloquently debated, and had a large minority vote.

But, behold the change! Maryland, which was expected first to move in the cause of emancipation, taking alarm from such interference, has inserted a clause in her Constitution for the *perpetuity* of slavery! The whole mind of the slave States, has been thrown off from its former basis of growing favor toward emancipation, and put in an attitude of defence against foreign interference. The ingress of free blacks into the slave States has generally been interdicted; free colored residents have been banished from some parts, and in all places subjected to great disadvantages, and deprived of important privileges; the work of emancipation has been put in check, and the disposition for it quenched; rigorous defensive laws have been enacted and enforced; the intellectual, moral, and religious improvement of the slaves, which before was encouraged, and growing in popularity, has been very much abridged, and in some places entirely stopped; the slaves are subjected to a stricter watch, and treated with greater rigor, where causes of apprehension exist; scarcely an advocate of emancipation can be found in the slave States, where there were thousands, and tens of thousands before; freedom of speech and of the press, except on one side of the question, is chiefly suppressed; and the entire slave-holding portion of the Union, instead of being engaged, as before, in meliorating the condition of the slaves, mitigating the rigors of the system, and marching forward toward the goal of final emancipation, has been forced into an attitude, and into measures of defence against the *political* abolition of the free States.

We ask, if these are not very impressive and very instructive facts?—The lessons of experience teach us, that it is safe to judge of the future from the past, of what is to come from what has happened. Such being our rule of judgment, it is manifest, that, as political abolition has yet done nothing but injury to the cause it has taken in hand, and injury on an immense scale, it will do nothing but injury in time to come.

16. *Civil war.*

We are not fond of alarming topics, nor disposed to excite unnecessary anxiety. But the evils of political abolition, rising up in the North, must be faced, and the consequences it tends to, must be considered. However averse the people of the free States may be to slavery—and we believe they are almost universally so—yet they can not but feel, that this remedy of political abolition is worse than the disease, first, because the rudeness and violence of the treatment only aggravate it; and next, because they fear, that the medicine, if administered as proposed, will kill both the patient and the doctor. A dissolution of the Union would be as certain as any effect of a moral cause that can be reckoned on. Nor is it likely, that this would be the end. The political asperities and exasperations that would grow out of such a conflict, would themselves naturally be breeders of other convulsions; and it would not be strange, if some military chieftain, or chieftains, should rise up in the struggle, to make slaves of all freemen, and bind in stronger chains, those whom, by such means, it is proposed to set free.

We are a family of States, bound together by a covenant solemnly ratified, which prescribes the rights of each. In this family, concord is beautiful; but family quarrels are the worst of all. Civil war is the most terrible and most desolating of all wars, and most difficult to be brought to an end. Look at Spain. Will any one say, that such a movement, as the political abolition of the North, does not put in jeopardy the peace of this Union, and the Union itself? And can any human foresight tell what scenes of strife it is likely to produce, if it

should be encouraged to pass on its way towards the supreme power of the nation, which is now its avowed aim?

17. *The effect of political abolition on the annexation of Texas.*

Under the present extent of our national jurisdiction, we can not see much occasion of jealousy between the North and South, in regard to slavery, if the Federal Constitution should be scrupulously observed by all parties. But, if political abolition in the North insists on making its demonstrations and advances towards the South, it is very natural that the South should endeavor to fortify itself by all means in its power; and it is not to be disguised, that the annexation of Texas, as a slave State, itself a field for the growth of several slave States hereafter to be erected, would strengthen their balance of power in the Union, and tend to give them a preponderance. Doubtless this question will be agitated, and the strongest motive of the South, and its strongest argument for the annexation, will be the growth and influence of Northern political abolition. In whatever aspect, therefore, we view this movement, it threatens to disturb the Union. Leave the slave States, just where the Federal Constitution has placed them, unmolested in their Constitutional securities, and we can not see any good reason why they should be anxious for the annexation of Texas—certainly not to urge it. But the continued agitation of political abolition in the North, will give them an apology, and be a strong incentive for efforts to attain that end. If the free States, by reason of the *fact* of political abolition moving on in the midst of them, can not say to the slave States,—Your Constitutional securities shall be respected—their ground of opposition to the annexation of Texas will be greatly weakened, and the slave States will have a power of motive and a force of argument, which would not otherwise be felt. There is no other public question likely soon to rise in the public mind of this country, in the disposal of which political abolition in the North would so embarrass the friends of the Union. If this consideration should operate as fuel to the hopes of the abolition party, we should be very sorry; but it is too important, as a warning to the country, to pass unnoticed. A feeling that will be gratified in the approach of difficulties that will engender greater difficulties, and which possibly may end in what would startle common minds to think of, is one that ought to give us concern, if it is to have influence in contributing to such a result.

18. *The suicidal character of political abolition.*

It is taken for granted, that, if political abolitionists were to vote for the one or the other of the two great parties of the country, they would not support the party that is opposed to emancipation in all forms, and which, in possession of power, would use it against abolitionists with a vengeance. There are numerous other reasons, political, moral, and religious, why the Abolitionists generally would not support that party. Their sympathies naturally run in another direction. But do they not see, that every *two* votes they give for political abolition, is *one* vote to raise that party to power, and defeat themselves, not only as to what they vote for, but in other great interests of society, to which they can not be indifferent, though they may shut their eyes to them?—This *diverted* action of political power—it is averred to be 40,000 votes in the free States—in a nice balance of the two great parties, may throw the government of the States and the nation into hands that will ruin us all, as they have heretofore tried to do, with no small success. By this means, the political Abolitionists have again and again defeated the candidates they would most of them otherwise vote for, both for State and national legislation and government, and raised to power men with whom they have little or no sympathy, political, social, moral, or religious.

19. *The responsibility of using the franchise, or ballot, for political abolition.*

Such a use of the ballot is political abolition itself. We hope it may be quite unnecessary to say, that we can not innocently violate our allegiance to the State, for a benevolent object; and we trust we have satisfactorily shown, that the slavery of the slave States is placed *beyond* the Constitutional power of the free States by the compact of the Union. Is there, then, no responsibility in attempting to break down a foreign power—foreign to *us*,—by such weapons? A mission of benevolence, which might otherwise be very commendable, becomes a crime, when moral obligations are trampled under foot in the enterprise. By what authority can we violate a covenant, to do a good act?—Shall we say, that the good to be attained is *paramount*, and erect our individual *feelings* into a court to set aside *public law?*

But to the responsibility arising from moral considerations, is to be added that of disregard to the general welfare of the republic. Is it not strange, unnatural, that American citizens, by casting their votes where they have no chance of success, should thus contribute to augment and perpetuate the common misfortunes of the country, by raising men to power, who, they know, are advocates of destructive measures? More than this:—are these Abolition voters *conscientious* men—*religious?* How, then, before God, can they be acquitted, if *by their means*, such men as Robert Dale Owen, a *partner* of Fanny Wright, and member of the 28th Congress, and Ely Moore, of the Fanny Wright school, and member of the 24th and 25th Congresses, elected by the infidel ticket, are to make laws for this nation · and if such men as

Thomas Herttell, also of the Fanny Wright school, who, in 1833, moved in the legislature of New York, to lay on the table the motion for daily prayers during the Session, and thus stifled the public recognition of Providence—are to make laws for the States? Like the dog in the manger, the political abolitionists will neither eat hay, nor allow a hungry ox to eat it.

Yet more than this:—*Suppose*—for there is no reasonable motive for such action without some *hope* of success—*Suppose*, that, by one step, and in one year, the political Abolitionists could attain supreme power in the nation. Knowing their designs, because they are declared, would not every reflecting man tremble at the consequences? Are there many men in their own ranks, that would *dare* to look such a posture of public affairs in the face? The same, precisely, is the character, object, and peril of the enterprise, in the position which it now occupies, and in the successive stages of its actual progress. Every man who votes that way at the polls, incurs this tremendous responsibility. He can not disengage himself from the obligations of an American citizen, and say, he will leave the Constitution to take care of itself, or vote to break it down. The American Government may be imperfect in some of its parts —what human edifice is not? But it is a great, a responsible, a momentous trust, confided to the ballot-box. It was a great compromise of feeling and interest between numerous parties, and was formed under circumstances of peculiar trial. Now, that some of the parties have waxed strong *by the profit* of the Union, will they dare to take the responsibility of upsetting it, because some one or more of its terms do not suit them? Are they at liberty, *as conscientious men*, to do it? The object they have in view, is neither within the sphere of their political, nor of their social duty, however their *moral feelings* may be so inclined. Surely they will not plead *conscience* to violate a *contracted* obligation, to go out on a mission of benevolence!

### 20. *The spirit of bragging.*

It gives us pain and anxiety, whenever we hear people of one part of the Union boasting, that they can do without the other. We entreat all such to consider, that the American Government, and American society, imperfect though it may be, cost *too much* to be made thus light of. It is too important in itself, and too important as a spectacle to the world. From the time of its setting up till this hour, the whole world have been gazing at it *as a great experiment*, and it still occupies that position in the public eye of mankind. And are we who are responsible for its operation, and for the results it may work out, so to trifle with the trust, as to commit it all to the winds of chance again, because it is not so perfect as we could wish?—Do we prefer the hazards of a civil commotion, for the *possibility* of a more speedy social improvement, to the slower progress of a pacific reform!

### 21. *Misrepresentation—Exaggeration.*

The way to excite sympathy, is to sketch a strong and glowing picture of suffering under injustice. It is in this way, that abolition preachers, lecturers, books, and papers, have labored to work on the feelings of those who know nothing of slavery by actual observation. They have misrepresented facts, and given exaggerated accounts. They have not only been careful to tell nothing but the worst things of slavery, but they have made the bad worse than it is.

Not to justify slavery—God forbid we should do that—it is nevertheless true, that nearly all the evils ascribed to it, may be found in other regions and in other relations of society, in forms equally aggravated, though not, perhaps, in cases equally numerous. Do we hear of owners of slaves treating them with great severity, or maiming, or killing them, in a fit of passion? The same is to be found in the relations of masters and apprentices, of parents and children, of husbands and wives, in the free States. Are slaves, in some cases as on the cotton, sugar, and rice plantations, over-worked? If we take the evidence of British Parliamentary records, furnished by Government Commissioners, there is a *greater amount* of oppression of this kind inflicted on the *half million* of operatives in British manufactories, than on the *whole two million and a half* of slaves in the United States, as derived from any sources of evidence whatever. Does the extensive mingling of European and African blood evince the prevalence of the crime that produced it? We have not, indeed, the same *species* of evidence to establish this indictment against the white population of the free States; but there are other proofs of the fact to a wide extent. To the domestic slave-trade, and its consequent moral and social evils, there is confessedly no *exact* parallel in the free States; nevertheless, there are practices of the same moral character, leading to like results. As to acts of cruelty and inhumanity, of maiming and killing, they are not peculiar to a state of slavery; and the interest of masters in preserving unhurt the physical constitution of their slaves, is a better security against inhumanity, than any laws of society. In British manufactories, masters have not the same motives of interest to preserve the physical vigor of operatives by humane treatment, as the maimed and the helpless are cast on the parish. Hence we find, that the human constitution is more frequently destroyed, in British factories, by overwork and cruel treatment, than among the slaves of the United States. A case of the latter is rarely to be found, while those of the former are numerous.

This, we believe, is a fair statement. But it would doubtless subtract somewhat from the force of abolition preaching, among those who depend for information on the lecturers.

*22. But it is slavery.*

This can not be denied. But the Abolitionists are doing nothing to help that. Not a single step have they yet taken tending to relieve the doom, but every measure they have adopted, has only served to confirm it, and to make it worse. They *proclaim* liberty, and *establish* slavery. They have stepped into the path of emancipation, arrested its progress, and put it back, no one can tell how long.

This consideration, established as it is by *fact*, ought to have great weight on the conscience of those who, we think, must stand responsible before God and man, first, for having turned the favorable feeling toward emancipation in those who alone have power to effect it, into disfavor, and to a large extent, into opposition; and secondly, for having made the condition of slaves much worse, and more hopeless, than it was before.

We are aware, that some Abolitionists will fly from this charge, by saying, they are not responsible for consequences, after having done their duty. But the very question of duty depends, in part, on a consideration of consequences. If, before action, it should be said, we can not believe in such consequences, or we trust it will not be so, there might be some apology for ignorance. But, when the consequences have actually come to pass, and give a sure index of a continued result of the same character, from the same cause, we do not see how there can be any apology or excuse for such action.

The following are facts of history, as they bear on this question: 1. The Constitution of the United States has left slavery in the slave States, entirely under the control of those States. No persons, and no power, foreign to those States, can reach or touch slavery in their bounds, without their consent. 2. There was a growing favor, in the slave States, toward emancipation, before Northern Abolition commenced its movement toward and upon them. This feeling had existed, to a wide extent, among the greatest and most influential men of those States, and commendable efforts were in progress among slaveholders, to meliorate the condition of slaves, to instruct, moralize, and Christianize them, and to prepare the way for whatever of good might result from such efforts. The State of Virginia had made a powerful movement in a Convention called to amend the Constitution, and in her legislature, for an Act of emancipation. But, 3. It is no less true, as all know, that this feeling has been repressed, and this movement checked, since Northern Abolition broke out, the former being the effect of the latter as a cause. The intellectual and moral improvement of the slaves has been to a great extent suspended, and they have been treated with greater rigor. Their bondage has been made stronger, and its evils aggravated.

Is there no responsibility in this, when it was known, that there was a Constitutional barrier, over which Northern Abolition, as a political movement, could not pass, and when it *might*, and therefore *should* have been known, that, by moral necessity, such would be the effect of such a cause? Though it should be said, it is wrong that the slave States should have been so provoked, is there no wrong in the provocation? We can not but feel, that the *provokers* will be held responsible for this result, as well in the court of heaven, as in the moral sense of mankind. It can not be denied, that they have laid waste that garden of good feeling in the slave States, which Providence had planted and nourished so long, and which promised so much good fruit for the benefit of the slave, and converted it into something like a sterile wilderness. Nor can it be denied, that, by the same means, the chains of slavery have been riveted tighter than before, its evils enhanced, and its prospects darkened. We speak of *facts*, and all know, that these *are* facts, and that such is the CAUSE.

*23. What the people of this country will not permit.*

In our opinion, they will not permit the Constitution of the United States to be broken, to accomplish the ends of Abolition. The Constitutional boundaries of influence and control over slavery, are now pretty well recognised by all parties. They have been much better defined since the movement of Northern political Abolition commenced, than before. This debate, and this recognition of the Constitutional rule on the subject, have brought multitudes in the free States to a pause, who were otherwise disposed to favor this movement, and who are always ready to do everything *Constitutional* for the Abolition of slavery throughout the Union. This feeling of respect for the Constitution, and of opposition to slavery, is the prevailing feeling of the free States; and for our part, we desire it may ever be so. In this state of things, since the people of the free States can not Constitutionally, in the use of their political rights, step over the bounds into the slave States, to act upon the institution of slavery, they will very naturally, and for aught we can see, may very properly, desire and require to be rid of its responsibility, being, as they generally are, conscientiously opposed to it. This, we doubt not, the slave States will be disposed to grant. It can hardly be denied, that the people of the free States have had reason to feel, that heretofore they have been made in some degree responsible for slavery by the action of the Federal authorities, by requirements made of their

own State authorities, and in other ways. It is probable, however, that results of this kind will be very much, if not satisfactorily relieved, by the operation of the principles settled in 1842 by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Prigg* vs. *the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*. That decision must necessarily be respected by all parties. We have assumed, in the former part of this Tract, that the free States are not responsible for slavery, which we believe to be sound doctrine resulting from the terms of the Union. Consequently, they can not fairly be made *practically* responsible. Let this be understood and acted upon by all parties, and we do not see any insuperable difficulty in maintaining harmoniously the original terms of the Union of these States. All minor controverted questions, arising out of slavery, can only be settled by time and the regular action of Constitutional authorities.

### 24. *What follows.*

By such an adjustment of the slave question, which has so long and so greatly agitated the public mind of this country, it will follow, if we mistake not, that slavery must be left where the Constitution has placed it, on the responsibility, and under the control of the States in which it exists. It will also follow, that any political action, originating in the free States, to act on the slavery of slave States, will not only be necessarily ineffectual, but improper and injurious. It will follow, moreover, that a return to the original mode of action on slavery for its abolition, *by moral means*, is the only course, which the opposers of slavery in the free States, can Constitutionally pursue. With this, will also follow the hope of an ultimate attainment of the end. Manifestly, there is no hope for it as a result of political Abolition in the free States. Every aspect of the question has only waxed worse and worse, and the end in view has been placed at a farther remove by this agitation, as we have before had occasion to notice, and the facts of which are undisputed. *Moral means* have heretofore operated well. They are the means of Christianity—means which GOD himself has ordained, benevolent in character, and beneficent in their effect.

### 25. *The duty of anti-slave men in the free States as American citizens.*

They can not of course disregard their obligations of fealty to the Constitution of the United States, for any *foreign* object, however good and meritorious it might be in itself considered. It would be equally proper for them to violate the Constitution to suppress slavery in any of the nations of Europe, or in any other foreign parts, as to violate it to suppress slavery in any of the States of this Union. As regards slavery, the States are as independent of each other, and of the General Government, as any two nations are in their relations.

All citizens of the free States, therefore, who desire to see an end of slavery in this Union, by Constitutional means, can hardly have failed to have their attention arrested by the deplorable spectacle exhibited in the slave States, as the result of Northern political Abolition, in the putting back of the work of emancipation so far and so greatly, in destroying the better feelings of masters toward their slaves, and in creating a strong current of feeling in those States against any purpose or plan of emancipation whatever. They must have seen, that political Abolition in the free States, has committed an error, not only of infinite magnitude, but of a corresponding responsibility. As friends of the slave, therefore, as the enemies of slavery in all forms, and as good citizens, owing allegiance to the Constitution, we think they can not fail to see a line of duty marked out to them, which will induce them, not only to abstain from countenancing, but to lend all their influence in opposing so destructive and hopeless an enterprise as political Abolition. If a "tree be known by its fruits," the evidence of its character in this case, one would think, ought to be deemed sufficient.

### 26. *Indications of Providence.*

It is the prerogative of Providence to bring good out of evil, and out of the evil actions of men. Observe the following facts: 1. African slavery, in the West, was begun by the nations of Europe. 2. Those very nations, including those which sprung from them in this Western world, are now, for the most part, acting in concert to suppress the slave trade. 3. Christian philanthropists, from among these nations, are making simultaneous efforts, to explore Africa, to develop its resources and capabilities, to Christianize and civilize its tribes, and to present inducements for lawful commerce. Witness the plans and progress of African Colonization from the United States, and corresponding labors in Great Britain, for the benefit of the African race. 4. The torrid regions of Africa appear to be the natural home of the colored races, and as such constitute a Providential indication of the course to be pursued by those who seek to elevate and establish them in a social and political standing among the nations of the earth. 5. Great, atrocious, and indisputable, as was the crime of the slave trade, which has justly received the reprobation of all mankind, it has nevertheless been so overruled by Providence, that those portions of the race which have survived the cruelties and inhumanities inflicted, have been improved and elevated in a state of slavery. They are the best portions of the race, and most capable of doing good to their brethren, whenever a general emancipation shall be effected. 6. The slaves of the United States are the best and most capable portions

of the race anywhere to be found. 7. And consequently, the crime of man, for which neither defence, nor palliation, can be made, may be overruled by Providence for the general good of the race, when a plan of universal emancipation shall be perfected and carried out. That the tendencies of human society are in that direction, is sufficiently evident. To retard this movement, by attempting to precipitate the event with violent means, is what we object to.

Believing in the progress of society, we may see, in this great circle of Providence, an apparent *preparation* for the social elevation and political independence of the African race. This grand result, however, can not be forced. A race so debased as the African tribes were, when they themselves, in barbarous warfare, made captives of each other, for purposes of trade, and thus originated this public mart of their own flesh and blood, were never known to be raised to the highest conditions of man's earthly existence in a brief period.

If the United States were *one* State, a political movement for the emancipation of slaves, might be hopeful of good. It is still so in any component parts of the slave States. But any movement of this kind, foreign to those States, designed to act upon them, will of course be regarded as an interference, in view of the terms of the Union, and thus, by moral causes, thrust in by force upon the surface of society, this great movement of Providence, gradually and constantly developing, in favor of the African race, is arrested and put backward.

27. *The best judges.*

It is very uncharitable, and not less injurious to the cause of emancipation, for those who know nothing of slavery by experience or observation, to undertake to *dictate* to slaveholders how they shall act. It is injurious, because they who give this advice, have no power of control, and it is only regarded as an interference. It is uncharitable to condemn slaveholders in the mass, because a large portion of them solemnly aver, apparently in all good conscience, that they look upon slavery as an evil, and desire to see an end of it, but are deterred from immediate emancipation by considerations of humanity to the slaves themselves. The sweeping and indiscriminate denunciations of Abolitionists on *all* slaveholders, have a pernicious effect on those who are favorable to emancipation. They know, at least they think, that slavery, as a question of moral casuistry between themselves and God, is one which can not be fairly adjudicated by those who know nothing about it.

28. *Where the power lies.*

It is manifest from what has been said, that the power of emancipation is vested exclusively in the slave States, as far as respects slavery in their own bounds.

29. *Northern Abolition inhuman.*

We do not mean that it is so by design, but in *effect*. Doubtless the design is quite the contrary. But the effect, as we have seen, and as all eyes must observe, is to put obstacles in the way of emancipation, and to defer the day to an unknown period. The way in which Northern political Abolition has been managed, is the unkindest thing that could be done for the slave, and most subversive of the cause of humanity, because they have no power in the case, *by such weapons*, except to do harm to the cause which they profess to espouse.

30. *The most effective way.*

The moral position of the free States, eschewing slavery, and denouncing it, side by side as they stand with the slave States, and members of the same great national family, is one of great force, and can not fail of its influence, on a large scale, and with great effect. Recognising the limit of their power for political action, as defined by the Constitution, they are then at liberty to employ all moral and social influences, by speech and the press, which private citizens may choose to put and keep in action. In that course, they would find numerous allies in the slave States, and among slaveholders, as formerly.

31. *The moral influence of the antislave feeling in the free States is suppressed, by the existence of political Abolition in the North.*

Not only so, but the tendency of the controversy raised by it, is to abate this feeling of antipathy and opposition to slavery. It is the natural feeling of the free States, and ought to be cherished by them. But while they are obliged to contend against political Abolitionists, they are in danger of imbibing a feeling of toleration toward slavery itself. In the meantime, their moral influence against slavery is almost necessarily suspended. It is hardly possible for them to act in this field, as formerly, lest they should be suspected or accused of alliance with political Abolitionists; so that the effect of political Abolition is not confined to the *positive* injury it is constantly doing, by putting obstacles in the way of emancipation, in the slave States; but it puts a stop to the cause of emancipation in all forms, and in all quarters, and suspends, for the time being, nearly all action and influence of the entire anti-slavery phalanx of the Union. They can do nothing, while these mischief-workers are in the field; but are forced to be employed in preventing the evil of their machinations.

32. *Republican inconsistency—American Declaration of Independence.*

The following clause of the Declaration of American Independence :—"We hold these truths to be self-evident—That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—is often quoted, in the ears of Americans, with the finger pointed to American slavery; nor can it be denied, that the principles here announced, are a condemnation of the fact. Nevertheless, the purpose for which that Declaration was framed, and the object to which it was then applied, was simply to deny the divine right of kings, and the claimed prerogatives of high birth, and to assert and establish the right of a people to govern themselves. That the *principles* here stated are more comprehensive than this, there is no doubt, and that they apply to slavery anywhere, must also be admitted. But there is no inconsistency in this Declaration, as it was *applied* by those who framed and adopted it, they having exclusive regard to the relations of the Colonies to the British Crown, and to the tyranny of the latter over the former.

Thomas Jefferson, the Author of the Declaration, professed to be an emancipationist. His views on slavery were frequently and freely expressed, and the following passage in his *original* draft of the Declaration of Independence, not adopted, will show where he put the blame :—"He" (the king) "has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty, *in the persons of a distant people*, who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur a miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of *infidel* powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished dye, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms against us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people upon whom he also *obtruded* them—thus paying off former crimes committed against the *liberties* of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the *lives* of another."

Mr. Jefferson also took the first opportunity, after the separation, and during the war, to cause an act to be passed in the Virginia legislature, *to prohibit* the importation of slaves. And the other slave States followed the example.

33. *Slavery a wrong.*

Slavery is undoubtedly a wrong done to the natural rights of those enslaved, and the earliest possible emancipation, when unable to gain their own freedom, will be contrived and effected for them by those who appreciate the value of the right. But when it is to be effected by offices of *mediation*, it is a *moral* enterprise, and the master is to be consulted. If it is to be done by *force*, it is a *political* enterprise, *and the cost must be counted.*

34. *But the wrong should be righted, and righted now.*

That it should be *righted*, we agree; but that righting it *now*, will itself be right, is a question; and that may depend on many other questions. 1. It may depend on who did the wrong. If he can be found, it is doubtless incumbent on him to set about righting it instantly. 2. If he can not be found, the question is, who is to act as his substitute? 3. It may depend on the present condition of the subject of the wrong. 4. In any case, it depends on who is to undertake it. As a crusade, it might be a *wrong* interference. 5. As to the great, complicated, stupendous question of slavery, questions equally great, complicated, and stupendous, are involved in its abolition.

35. *The Buffalo Abolition Convention—Their Manifesto.*

In August, 1843, a national Convention of political Abolitionists assembled at Buffalo, N. Y., and nominated a President and Vice President of the United States, to be voted for in 1844, at which time they published the following Manifesto, as their latest creed, which, we suppose, is the best authority :

"*Whereas*, The Constitution of these United States is a series of agreements, covenants, or contracts between the people of the United States, each with all and all with each; and

"*Whereas*, it is a principle of universal morality, that the moral laws of the Creator are paramount to all human laws; or, in the language of the Apostle, that "we ought to obey God rather than men;" and

"*Whereas*, the third clause of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States,—when construed as providing for the surrender of a fugitive slave—*does* "rest upon such a basis," in that it is a contract to rob a man of a natural right—namely, his natural right to his own liberty; and, is therefore, absolutely *void*—

"Therefore, *Resolved*, That we hereby give it to be distinctly understood, by this nation and the world, that, as Abolitionists, considering that the strength of our cause lies in its righteousness, and our hope for it in our conformity to the LAWS OF GOD and our respect for the RIGHTS OF MAN, we owe it to the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe as a proof of our allegiance to Him, in all our civil relations and offices, whether as private citizens, or as public functionaries sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, to

regard and to treat the third clause of the fourth article of that instrument, whenever applied to the case of a fugitive slave, as utterly null and void, and consequently, as forming no part of the Constitution of the United States, whenever we are called upon, or sworn, to support it."

As we are not in controversy with these gentlemen as to the *validity* of the claim of the slave to his emancipation, we fully according thereunto, but only as to their *mode* of accomplishing the end, and also as to the *ground* on which this document asserts the claim, we ask attention to a few remarks on the Manifesto itself.

It must be confessed, that this is an extraordinary, and a somewhat *startling* document. How the *conscientious* men of their party will be able to digest the *Resolution* that sets aside a part of the Constitution of the United States, pronouncing it "*utterly null and void*," which, indeed, *annihilates* it, "as forming *no part* of the Constitution," is more than we can say. It is manifest, that a right to strike out this part, is a right to strike away the whole; and so far as we can see, the blow at this part, is a blow at the whole. We can not feel it is too much to say, that that sacred and venerable Charter of our Government, the cost of which shook this Continent and shook the world, is here taken in hand, cast upon the ground, and stamped upon, as of no worth and no authority.

The reasoning by which this act is justified, is no less extraordinary. The whole transaction is based on the *authority of religion*, as interpreted by the actors, and invokes its highest sanction, "the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe." It is true, that another element of authority is picked up, by going back to a supposed state of man before he enters into society, commonly called "the state of nature," out of which grow "natural laws," and "natural rights;" but *religion* is the foundation, superstructure, and finish of the whole. We will first dispose of the *profane* part of the argument, or the *law of nature* part.

Let it be observed, that we do not undertake to *disprove*, that man has "natural rights," or that the claim of a slave to freedom is a valid one, both of which we fully accord to. We only wonder, that a conclusion of such tremendous consequence, as that arrived at in this document, should have no other profane authority (*profane* in distinction from *sacred*) brought to its support, than the undefined rule of "natural right."

"The law of nature," says Blackstone, "is the will of God." Justinian says, "it is to live honestly." Blackstone's comment on this, is, "not to injure society." "The *foundation*" of natural law, Blackstone says, is, "that man should pursue his own true and substantial happiness," which, he adds, is "the *substance* of the law of God." He also says, that "to *know* the law of nature, it is necessary to have recourse to *reason*;" but he adds, as man's "reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error," "immediate and direct revelation, to be found only in the Holy Scriptures," is to be consulted.

NATHAN DANE, the great American jurist, speaks of "the laws of nature and reason, made by God himself." "The law of nature," he says, "is a perfect rule, but is understood only by *a right use of reason*." "A state of nature," he says, "wants a *common* judge," which society sets up. Again:—"Civil laws are those of nature *modified* and *perfected*." Again:—"A state of nature is a state of *despotism and wretchedness*," because, "if one may do as he pleases, another may, and each is his own judge, and judges the Judges." He says that justice in this way is obtained, "not probably more than once in twenty cases." Again:—"In a state of nature, heated and passionate men are the judges." "Hence," he says, "it is easy to see how much this poor free man's liberty, so much extolled by some, is worth to him, *on the whole*."

We have made these quotations, merely to show what an *indefinite and unsettled* rule the law of nature is. The more we cite legal authorities to this point, the more we shall be puzzled. They themselves don't pretend to understand it. Like sensible men, they set themselves to determine what law is as *fixed by society*, and they know no other. That there are "natural rights," which men may be compelled to resort to on emergencies, there is no doubt; but, instead of being the best, or even good authority, in the social state, they are the worst and most dangerous possible. They are for extremities, as a necessity, not for common use. The result of the whole is, as stated above, by *Mr. Dane*—that "*civil* laws are those of nature *modified and perfected*." The aims of the structure of civil jurisprudence have been, to ascertain, as well as could be, *the law of nature*, so called, by a general concurrence of opinion, and with Christian jurists, as Blackstone above intimates, by consulting "an immediate and direct revelation," the Bible. The best authority, therefore, is not to go back to a *state* of nature—for that is where man first began, and is, as Mr. Dane above says, "a state of *despotism and wretchedness*;"—but it is to consult that system of jurisprudence, which the wisdom and justice of many ages, and the most civilized and Christion nations, have established.

A man alone in the world, in a state of nature, would doubtless have a right—call it "natural," if you please—to anything he can lay his hand upon—a right to *go* where he pleases, and *do* what he pleases, except as his Creator might command otherwise. But the moment he enters into society, this liberty, or system of natural rights, is abridged, while other rights are multiplied; and if the state of society is good, his newly-acquired rights are more valua-

ble. His former liberty, or natural rights, *yield* to the regulations of society; and we can not think of any one of them which may not be affected, or even taken away, by such regulations. The right to breathe, for example, is the strongest of all natural rights; but society assumes the right to stop a man's breath by hanging, if his acts should expose him to such a sentence of the law. We can not conceive of a government of *law*, which recognises any other authority than that of the laws themselves, in determining social rights. They may be right, or they may be wrong. Nevertheless, while they exist, they are the rule. To oppose them, is rebellion; to live without law, is anarchy; or what Mr Dane calls the "despotism and wretchedness of a *state of nature*." To give "*natural rights*" as authority to resist law, is the most indefinite rule, and the most dangerous authority, that could be adduced.

And yet, *let it be observed*, that "natural right" is the *only* authority, on which this Buffalo Abolition Convention Manifesto is founded! It is first *assumed*, then merged in *religion*, and "the Supreme Ruler of the Universe" is made responsible for the *result!* He is appealed to, his sanction is invoked, and it is all done in his name! The whole of it, from beginning to end, is a *religious business, based on a religious sentiment!* Read it, and judge.

36. *The proper rule.*

*We* take the settled and *definite* opinions of mankind, as collected and recorded in the most approved systems of civil jurisprudence, and as established in the most free Governments and most liberal institutions of human society, to establish the claim of the slave to his freedom. These are *recognised* authorities, from which nobody can escape. The American Declaration of Independence *alone* is sufficient. And we take these established principles, to work with them by ways and means equally well established. *Here* is the essential, the vital, the momentous point, in which we differ from political Abolitionists.

37. *Church and State.*

There is not a more religious people in the world, than we of the United States; yet no people have been more scrupulous, by their State papers, by practical legislation, and by general feeling, in separating religion from a participation in the authorities of State. They give full scope to the *moral* influence of religion, but jealously deny to it *political power. If there be any one principle more firmly settled in the public mind of this country, or better established, by universal consent, and with fixed purpose, than another, or all others, we think it is,* THAT RELIGION SHALL NOT USURP AUTHORITY IN THE AFFAIRS OF GOVERNMENT.

38. *Political Abolition a religious movement.*

Look at this Buffalo Manifesto. Is it not a religious document? "The moral laws of the Creator are paramount to all human laws;" "we ought to obey God, rather than man;" "considering that, as Abolitionists, the strength of our cause lies in its righteousness, and our hope for it in our conformity to the laws of God;" "we owe it to the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe, as a proof of our allegiance to Him," &c., "to regard and to treat the third clause of the fourth Article of the Constitution of the United States," &c., "*as utterly null and void*," &c. Is not religion the rule, the sanction, *the everything* involving responsibility in this transaction? Nor is it a declaration of principles *to suffer*, but of principles *to act;* nor of *submission*, but of *aggression;* nor for the use of *moral* means alone, but to take hold on *political power;* they are a *political party*, and were at that moment assembled to nominate a President and Vice President of the United States!

Men, making the highest religious pretensions, have taken lead, and are at the head of the movement; numerous religious papers are employed to advocate it; a large corps of religious missionaries are in the field to preach it; numerous churches and pulpits are chiefly devoted to it, and are thence called Abolition Churches; its most religious Champion, Mr. Gerritt Smith, has publicly announced, that he will go forth, and preach the doctrine in Christian pulpits, on the Christian Sabbath; and religion everywhere is the high and holy sanction relied upon to enforce the doctrine. Nearly all the political Abolitionists, and with scarcely an exception, all the abolition preachers, lecturers, and missionaries, are religious men. It is, indeed, *a proper religious enterprise.* In this statement we have disclosed A GREAT, IMPORTANT, MOMENTOUS FACT.

39. *Confession of a leading Abolitionist.*

Since we published the first edition of this Tract, we have had a conversation with a leading Abolitionist, than whom no one has been more prominent or more influential as such. He expressed a wish, that we would make some alterations in this sheet, for greater good, as we have done. We were surprised at the interest he took in it, and are only sorry we could not follow his advice in all its extent. He said, "The Abolitionists, as a body, are honest people, BUT THEIR LEADERS ARE CORRUPT AND UNPRINCIPLED." We were startled at this, coming from such a source; but he repeated with emphasis:—"THE LEADERS ARE CORRUPT AND UNPRINCIPLED." We were forced to believe, that such was his conviction, and that no man knew better. It was said so seriously, so emphatically, and apparently with such honesty of

purpose, that we have taken the liberty to think, he would not object, that the public should be aware of it.

40. "*We must obey God rather than man.*"

So says the Buffalo Manifesto, having *assumed* the thing to be proved, viz: that God commands it. It is obvious there is no answer to this reason, or no reasoning with such persons, if they *think* they have such authority. If they could prove their mission by miracles, it would be sufficient; but as this is only *their opinion*, a sentiment of their *own*, the conscience of those who think otherwise, is at least as good as theirs, and worthy of as much respect. Other Christians, and the great majority think, that God has not commanded this; that, in the days of the Apostles, when the state of political society was a great deal worse than it is now, and slavery far worse and more extensive, as history attests, not only was submission to "the powers that be," enjoined on all Christians, even to martyrdom, but "servants" (*slaves*) were commanded "to obey their masters *in all things*;" that St. Paul sent back Onesimus, a fugitive slave, to his master, Philemon, to be treated according to his will, thereby recognising Philemon's authority in the case; that the Apostles not only had a special authority by immediate revelation from God in regard to the matters referred to when they said, "We ought to obey God rather than man," but that they did not say this as a reason for disobeying existing regulations of society; that both Christ and his Apostles were most scrupulous observers of all such regulations, and could always defend themselves on that ground; that the duty of such submission to such authorities is paramount to man's individual right to arraign the law; that obedience to civil society results from Divine command; that political society, as it exists at any time, in any place, is "the ordinance of God," requiring our submission; that God's government, or Christ's kingdom is *moral*, in distinction from the political edifices of man; and that the design of Christianity is to avail itself of the *order* of political society, without being responsible for its defects, *to set all things right, by making all hearts good.* Hence, as *they* think, the scrupulous care and frequent injunctions of Christ and his Apostles *not to disturb society*, as its peace and order are necessary to accomplish the aims of Christianity.

41. *A Deduction.*

If the above thoughts are correct—we believe they are—it will follow, that no man can, with propriety or good reason, invoke Divine authority to justify a use of political power in upsetting political society, or reforming the State. If a Christian employs political power to attain what he thinks desirable in the State, he does it as a member of the political commonwealth, and not as being on a mission from God, armed with a Divine command, imperative on himself, and which he may proclaim as imperative on all others. No Christian, in our view, is authorized to invoke such a Divine sanction for such an act. It is, if we mistake not, identical with the principle, which we, as American citizens and American freemen, in our organization of political society, have very distinctly and very emphatically repudiated, viz: the authority of religion *in* the State and *over* it. And yet, as all will see, this is precisely the sanction of the Buffalo Manifesto, and precisely the principle on which that document is founded. The American people have solemnly resolved and declared, *against* the usurpation of authority in the State by religion. And yet, *here it is, sprung upon us by surprise*, by the public act of a public Convention, with the declared object of overrunning and revolutionizing the State, and the first step taken has been to plant its foot on the Supreme law of the land, proclaiming a part of it, "to this nation and to the world," "AS UTTERLY NULL AND VOID"—"ABSOLUTELY VOID!"

42. *The actual junction of religion and political power.*

They have organized as a party on the platform of this religioso-political creed; they have nominated a President and Vice President of the United States; they have gone forth into the field, established presses, opened churches, and set up pulpits; they have an army of agents and missionaries; their candidate for the Presidency, himself acting as an *agent and missionary*, boasted in Faneuil Hall, Boston, that they had increased from 7,000 in 1839, to 35,000 in 1843; and that it is an actual junction of religion and political power, appears from the facts, that religion is the sentiment, and the machinery of State the means employed to accomplish the end. If we rightly understand the essential elements of Church and State *united*, apart from the accidents of *form*, this appears to be *the thing*. It comprises the most potent agencies of the kind recognised in history, as it takes hold of the fundamental power of the State, and would sweep all before it, when once it shall have gained the ascendency.

43. *The Abolition Church.*

It is the party, and the party is a religious brotherhood. They have one creed, one faith, one baptism. To all others intolerant and denunciatory, they regard themselves as the only *pure* Church. They call, not only their political, but their religious opponents, "a brotherhood of thieves," "manstealers," "robbers," "murderers," "adulterers," "liars," "infidels," &c.

We take these epithets, thus bestowed, as they come from their presses, and are heard from their pulpits.

44. *This the only mode by which Church and State can be united in this country.*

If it is to come at all, it will not come in the forms heretofore known in history, but it will *steal* upon us. The old form would be instantly recognised, and reprobated. But, to succeed, it must take a form corresponding with the popular modes of action in American society. Can anything be nearer to it than this? It is the very model, the perfect type of our social system, in an original popular movement. It is nothing more, nothing less, but the *very thing*. We have only to ask, what is the *element* of this movement? Is it religion? Or is it not? If it is, then it is Church and State, and an attempt to unite the two.

45. *This would be a fearful power, if it should prevail.*

It is a power that mounts the hobby of *one* principle to ride over all others—a sword that cuts all ties, however sacred, for the sake of cutting one admitted to be bad. They do not consider, that the great principles of the moral and social system are numerous, all having their respective claims, and that, like men in society, they modify each other, in their practical application; but they take *one* out from all the rest, and propound it as an *abstraction* to govern the world—to break down every other that comes in its way.

It is no disparagement to state the well-known fact, that all religious sects have their favorite opinions, and often *one* favorite opinion. Holding them dear, they of course wish to see them reduced to practice, and if they had the power, they would not only urge them eloquently, but, preadventure, would enforce them rigorously. It is for this reason that religion is held to be a dangerous power in the State—certainly so, until we can be sure that the opinions adopted are sound. If a favorite opinion of a religious sect is unsound, and if it is to become a *hobby in power*, to be enforced any how, and by whatever means, it then becomes a *terrible* power. History exhibits too melancholy a record of devastations wrought in society by this cause, not to be a solemn warning.

46. *A difference between religion and true religion.*

There are a thousand, not to say ten thousand religions in the world, but only one that is *true*; and there are forms of Christianity by no means free from error. As a general rule, the more intolerant, fierce, and bloody a religion is, the farther is it from the pure religion of a pure Christianity. Is not political abolition intolerant? Is it not fierce? And who will say, that, in all its tendencies, it is not rushing onward to the opening of rivers and seas of blood?

47. *The duty of all true Christians in regard to this movement.*

The time is coming, *has* come, when religion, in the face and in violation of the American political creed and of American fundamental political law, is to be made responsible for an attempt to usurp the powers of State. It behooves all true Christians among us, to see, that *Christianity* is not held responsible for this. Christianity, rightly interpreted and properly understood, can not, in our view, be responsible for it. We do not deny, on the contrary we admit and believe, that many true Christians, with sincere and conscientious minds, have been and are being persuaded into the ranks of this religioso-political sect, and that it is chiefly effected by an appeal to their religious feelings. They are persuaded to believe things which are not true, and they listen to interpretations of Divine command, which are unwarranted in the application that is made of them. The line of demarcation between "rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," is effaced from their minds by the doctrines they read in abolition papers, and hear from abolition pulpits, and they lose sight of that great and fundamental principle of American institutions, equally important and equally precious to all freemen and to all religious sects, viz: that religion shall not have authority in the State, and may not usurp it. They are told, that "we ought to obey God rather than man;"—but they are not told that one part of such obedience is to "submit to the powers that be," that is, to the ordinances of civil society. The very precept that is invoked to lead them astray, is most directly in point to keep them right. They do not see, for the time being, though they may afterward see it with regret and sorrow, that religion, taking hold of the machinery of State, *as religion*, is entirely out of place, not only in regard to the design of our political institutions, but equally so in regard to the design of Christianity. The latter, in maintaining the character of a "kingdom not of this world," has a loftier mission, and more universal functions, than to raise a conflict with political powers, by using political weapons. Its errand is with the *heart*, and its power is *over* the heart. Its *moral* power is disarmed, the moment it resorts to *political* power, and God is no longer with it. The spirit has fled, and it is not Christianity, whatever may be its pretensions; nor can Christianity be made responsible for that which its precepts and spirit alike forbid. If these are just thoughts, every true Christian, as well as every true patriot, will be apprized of his duty in regard to political abolition. Most respectfully, most kindly, and with affectionate concern,

would we implore those Christians, who have honestly enlisted in this enterprise, to pause and consider. Their allegiance to God is doubtless first, highest, and most sacred. It is for that we invoke their allegiance to the State, because God has enjoined it. We implore them to consider both the scandal and prejudice that will attach to Christianity, by forcing religion into a political warfare, by buckling upon it a political harness, and putting into its hands political weapons, for an inevitable discomfiture. Can it for a moment be imagined, that the American people, having once opened their eyes to such an attempt, will tolerate it?

48. *Great Britain and American Abolition.*

In the political aspects of this question, it is scarcely possible for us to shut our eyes to the fact, that American citizens should stand up in the world's Convention at London, and pander to the lust of empire, and of the *world's* empire, nourished in that capital and by the Government of that country, by denouncing the Government of the United States, and conspiring with those who would embrace the first opportunity to overturn our institutions in a servile and civil war. That the policy of Great Britain is *morally* allied to the abolition movement of this country, is certain. The language that has been used by American Abolitionists, in Exeter Hall, London, and in other public places of that empire, can not but be regarded as utterly hostile to that fealty which every American citizen owes to the Government of his country. When words, and *such* words, are so strong, can the heart be right? If they have not already conspired, can there be any doubt, that they *would at any moment* conspire with the Government of that country to overthrow the Government of this, to accomplish their end?—Doubtless they are looked upon as *fellow-workers*, whenever the British Government shall have occasion to employ them.

49. *The denationalizing influence of political abolition.*

The conduct of American Abolitionists abroad, as above referred to, is an anomaly in the results of human society; at least, it is what no one could have anticipated, or would have predicted. If, indeed, there be anything in political abolition, which can so utterly *denationalize* Americans *born*, and set them against their own country, to denounce it publicly in foreign parts, and to show a disposition to enter into any conspiracy to overthrow the American Government, it is *high time* that so unpatriotic a movement *be understood and appreciated.*

50. *Perjury.*

We must farther solicit that honest and conscientious portion of the community, who, with the most upright designs, have, as we believe, been seduced by the leaders of political abolition into that faith, to consider the position in which they are placed as *religious men*, by adhering to and acting with the Abolitionists, in the way proposed. How can they, as American citizens, bound by all the solemnities of an oath of allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States—for that oath is always implied in a ballot, and in many States actually administered as a qualification—how *can* they subscribe to such a declaration as the Buffalo Manifesto, and then vote the abolition ticket, or how can they vote that ticket *at all*, having such a declared object, *without contracting the stain of* PERJURY *on their souls?* And is not the Manifesto itself *a subornation of perjury?*

51. *Another view of this perjury.*

It is certainly a most extraordinary case, as it is perjury *proposed*—and *publicly* proposed In this view it is *shameless.* It is farther than crime has ever before presumed to go. But observe the spectacle it would present, if it were carried out. The proposal and enterprise is, to obtain a political ascendancy in the national councils, and to elect the Federal officers to administer the Government of the country. They *invite* this whole nation to perjure themselves at the ballot-box! Is it not so?—What a scene would that be! And they set up the *pulpit of religion* to persuade them into it! They profess to do it all in the name and by the sanction of "the Supreme Ruler of the Universe!"

When they shall have accomplished this end, the President elect is to stand up before the nation and the world, and take the following oath:—"I do solemnly swear, that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, *preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.*" And he is to do this, with a proclamation in his right hand, before uttered and published, that he will do *neither*, and that he will violate *every part* of this oath! And the Vice President, and every member of Congress, and every Federal Officer, throughout the land, belonging to this party, is to do the same thing! Was such a scene ever before projected to be enacted in human society?—How it is possible to come to any other result, under the Buffalo Manifesto, we are utterly unable to see. A perjured people, a perjured Government, a perjured nation, punishing, in a common court of justice, with the heaviest penalties, that by which they attained their eminence!